UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,565	09/29/2003	Yoichi Kodama	1034232-000025	4272
21839 DIJCHANAN	7590 06/04/2007 DICERSOLL & POONE	V DC	EXAMINER	
POST OFFICE	+	HAIDER, SAIRA BANO		
ALEXANDRI	A, VA 22313-1404		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			1711	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
_		10/671,565	KODAMA ET AL.			
C	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Saira Haider	1711			
The Period for Re	e MAILING DATE of this communication app ply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORT WHICHEN - Extensions after SIX (6) - If NO period - Failure to re Any reply re	ENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY (ER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 In MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, decived by the Office later than three months after the mailing and term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠ Res	ponsive to communication(s) filed on 16 M	arch 2007.				
2a) This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
•	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
clos	ed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition o	f Claims		,			
4)⊠ Clai	m(s) <u>1,3,4 and 7</u> is/are pending in the appli	cation.				
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
	m(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Clai	⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,3,4 and 7</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Clai	m(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Clai	m(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
Application P	apers					
9) ☐ The	specification is objected to by the Examine	r.	·			
,	drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		Examiner.			
-	icant may not request that any objection to the					
Repl	acement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11) The	oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority unde	r 35 U.S.C. § 119					
•	owledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).			
1.	Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.				
2.	• • •	• •				
3.	' '	•	ed in this National Stage			
**	application from the International Bureau					
" See ti	ne attached detailed Office action for a list	or the certified copies not receive	a.			
Attachment(s)	0.1 1/072 222	n □	(DTO 440)			
	references Cited (PTO-892) raftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
3) Information	Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application			

Application/Control Number: 10/671,565 Page 2

Art Unit: 1711

DETAILED ACTION

1. The rejections have been maintained and altered in view of the amended claims.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 03/16/2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 4. Claims 1, 3, 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaya et al. in view of Matsuura et al. (US 5,508,357).
- 5. Yamaya discloses thermosetting resin compositions comprising a polyimide and a bismaleimide, wherein the resins exhibit excellent heat resistance properties. Specifically, Yamaya discloses the claimed bismaleimide with the meta-position substitution (Formula (III)) and the claimed polyimide (Formula (I) (col.2, lines 44-69; col. 4, lines 60-61, Table 1 (Examples 9-17)).
- 6. Yamaya fails to disclose that the thermosetting resin composition is present in a laminate composite comprising a metal foil layer and a polyimide layer, as claimed. However, Yamaya discloses that the thermosetting resin compositions are excellent in adhesion, formability, moldability, flexibility and heat resistance. Further, the resin compositions have numerous applications including as adhesives, laminates and molding materials in electrical and electronic equipment and apparatus (col. 6, lines 14-20). Attention is directed towards the Matsuura reference.

Application/Control Number: 10/671,565

Art Unit: 1711

7. Matsuura teaches similar polyimide/bismaleimide thermosetting compositions, where the

Page 3

materials are applied to metal foils and as adhesives between polyimide films and metal foils (col. 11

lines 51-62; col. 12 lines 34-63). The articles are formed to provide substrates for flexible printed

circuit boards or TAB tapes. It is the examiner's position that it would have been prima facie

obvious to use the polyimide/bismaleimide compositions of Yamaya's invention applied to metal

foils or between polyimide films and metal foils to form substrates for flexible printed circuit boards

or TAB tapes having Yamaya's improved toughness, flexibility, adhesion, and heat resistance

properties. The position is supported by the fact that the resin of Yamaya is exemplified as capable

of bonding to steel sheets (col. 7, line 31 to col. 8, line 2).

8. Regarding the limitations drawn to the polyimide, Yamaya teaches polyimides fitting the

claimed formulas (1) and (4) (col. 1 line 54-col. 2 line 30; examples).

9. In reference to the claim 7, Matsuura exemplifies that the thickness of the metal foil is 35 μm

(example 4). It would have been obvious to use the metal foil in the thickness specified by Matsuura

in order to fully embody the invention taught by the combination of Yamaya and Matsuura.

Response to Arguments

10. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of

applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., improved solder

heat resistance) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light

of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van

Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

11. Applicants have further argued that it would not have been obvious to substitute the meta

bismaleimide compounds of Yamaya in the invention of Matsuura. This is not the basis of the

rejection, as stated above, it is the examiner's position that given the disclosure of Yamaya regarding

suitability in electrical equipment, and given the teachings of Matsuura regarding a particular type of adhesive requiring laminate for use in electrical equipment, it would have been obvious to utilize the resin of Yamaya in the laminate disclosed by Matsuura.

12. Applicants have argued that the stainless steel described in the examples of Yamaya is different from the foil of the herein invention. The examiner notes that this citation of Yamaya is provided in order to support the fact that the resin of Yamaya is capable of bonding to metal, thus there exists a reasonable expectation that utilization of the Yamaya resin in the laminate composite of Matsurra would be successful.

Declaration under 37 CFR § 1.132

13. The declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed 2/15/2007 is sufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1-4 and 7 based upon Matsurra in view of Yamaya. However, the declaration is insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4 and 7 based upon Yamaya in view of Matsurra because the declaration fails to establish that it would not have been obvious to utilize the resin of Yamaya in the laminate composite taught by Matsurra.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saira Haider whose telephone number is (571) 272-3553. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck can be reached on (571) 272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/671,565

Art Unit: 1711

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Saira Haider Examiner Art Unit 1711

James J. Seidleck
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700